



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,611	04/03/2001	Sujit Sharan	95-0716.02	3508
7590	03/29/2004			EXAMINER
Charles Brantley Micron Technology, Inc. 8000 S. Federal Way Mail Stop 525 Boise, ID 83716				KILDAY, LISA A
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2829	
			DATE MAILED: 03/29/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/825,611	SHARAN ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lisa A Kilday	2829

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on election on 1/20/4.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 37-39 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 37-39 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/3, 1/2, 4/1.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: the claimed limitation of “an atmosphere” is not found in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang (6,294,466). In re claim 37, Chang in fig. 1 discloses an atmosphere for a chemical vapor deposition process, comprising:

A deposition gas (100a) having a pressure contribution and a chemical reactability, and a chemically inert gas (col. 11, lines 31-32; ref. 100d) mixed with said deposition gas (col. 11, lines 25-55). For examination purposes, the examiner would like to clarify that **all** gases have a pressure contribution. For examination purposes, the deposition gas (100a) has chemical reactability because Chang discloses that the deposition gas is TiCl4, which is a reactive gas as taught by the instant specification (see applicant's specification: ¶27). Since Chang discloses that the deposition gas is

TiCl₄, it must react chemically as taught by the applicant. Chang discloses that the chemically inert gas is Argon (col. 11, lines 30-35). Chang discloses that Argon is used and that Argon is an inert gas (col. 11, line 33).

Chang discloses the following method limitations: forming an atmosphere for CVD when reacting a deposition gas and chemically inert gas (col. 11, lines 48-52). Chang discloses limiting said pressure contribution of said deposition gas (col. 11, lines 40-51), and increasing said chemical reactability of said deposition gas (col. 12, lines 15-33).

Although Chang discloses the method limitations, the method limitations in the included in the instant claims drawn to the atmosphere are not given patentable weight unless the structure of the device is clear from the method limitations.

✓
EP
3-16-04

Product-by-process claims are not limited to the manipulations of the recited steps, only the structure implied by the steps. See MPEP 21 13. One skilled in the art cannot determine the method steps of producing the device by merely looking at the device. "(E)ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process; determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Note that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, In re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also In re

Brown, 173 USPQ 685; In re Luck, 177 USPQ 523; /n re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324; In re Avery, 186 USPQ 161 ; In re Wedheimt 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue; In re Marosi et al, 218 USPQ 289*, and particularly In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law make clear.

In re claim 38, Chang discloses wherein said deposition gas is a film precursor deposition gas (col. 11, lines 51-52).

In re claim 39, Chang discloses wherein said deposition gas is a metal film precursor deposition gas (col. 11, lines 35-36).

Conclusion

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0957. See MPEP 203.08.

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Lisa Kilday whose telephone number is (571) 272-1962. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamand Cuneo, can be reached on (571) 272-1957. The fax number for the group is (703) 872-9306. MPEP 502.01 contains instructions regarding procedures used in submitting responses by facsimile transmission.

Lisa Kilday

LAK

3/12/04


EVAN PERT
PRIMARY EXAMINER